



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,051	10/24/2003	Robert Derek La Gesse	050337-1380 (04CXT0054WL)	1539
24504 7590 07/13/2007 THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			EXAMINER WU, JUNCHUN	
			ART UNIT 2191	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/693,051	Applicant(s) LA GESSE ET AL.	
	Examiner Junchuñ Wu	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on May 4, 2007.
2. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled.
3. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-21, 23-24 are reject under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bunker (U.S. Patent No. 6,944,859 B1).

6. For claim 1, Bunker teaches
 - A method comprising: transferring a device driver file and a first portion of network-specific data from a station to a host computing device (see col.9 lines 28-34 "*After opening the synchronization session, the client-handheld conduit file is transmitted to the handheld computer. The client-handheld conduit file is received and installed on the handheld computer*").

Art Unit: 2191

- installing at said host computing device a device driver that is represented by said device driver file (col.9 lines 6-15).
- transmitting a data block into a shared-communications medium that constitutes a network (col.4 lines 56-58 & Fig.1), wherein said host computing device generates said data block and wherein said host computing device uses said device driver to transfer said data block to said station (col.9 lines 13-15 & col.10 lines 12-17); wherein said first portion of network-specific data defines said network (see col.5 lines 54-57 *"the client-handheld conduit file 232 is used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer."* & col.5 lines 16-19 *"The communications circuitry and the communications port preferably include one or more Network Interface Cards configured to communicate with the network".* i.e. *The conduit file implicitly included network-specific data*).

7. For claims 2 and 18, Bunger teaches

- displaying said first portion of network-specific data at said host computing device (col.10 lines 2-11; handheld computer may display the network-specific data stored on the handheld).

8. For claim 3 and 19, Bunger teaches

- reading an AutoRun file and executing a Setup file, wherein said AutoRun file and said Setup file are stored on said station and wherein said Setup file is for installing said device driver at said host computing device (col.6 lines 64-67 & Fig.4 Memory 410

Art Unit: 2191

included component 420; installation procedure is automatically install that implicitly included the autorun file, setup executable to install file).

9. For claims 4 and 20, Bungler teaches

- device driver file is stored at said station in one of a flash memory, a read-only memory, a programmable read-only memory, and a magnetic disk memory (Fig.3 Memory 310 included component 326).

10. For claims 5,10, and 21, Bungler teaches

- network-specific data define a security configuration and a network configuration (col.6 lines 12-14 & 19-21 & 41-44).

11. For claims 7,12, and 23, Bungler teaches

- network identifier is an IEEE 802.11 basic service set identifier (col.4 lines 61-65).

12. For claim 8,13,and 24, Bungler teaches

- a second portion of network-specific data resides at said station and is unreadable by said host computing device (col.8 lines 46-61; if the user is not valid, the client-handheld conduit is not installed. That means the handheld computer is unable to communicate with client computer. Thus the client data is unreadable from handheld computer).

13. For claim 9, Bungler teaches an apparatus comprising:

Art Unit: 2191

- A memory for storing a device driver file and a first portion of network-specific data (see col.6 lines 5-10 & Fig.3 the memory block 310 which includes client-handheld conduit file).
- a host interface for transferring said device driver file and said first portion of network-specific data to a host computing device (see col.9 lines 28-34 *"After opening the synchronization session, the client-handheld conduit file is transmitted to the handheld computer. The client-handheld conduit file is received and installed on the handheld computer"*).
- a transmitter for transmitting a data block into a shared-communications medium that constitutes a network (col.4 lines 56-58 & Fig.1), wherein said data block is received from said host computing device using a device driver that is represented by said driver file (col.9 lines 13-15 & col.10 lines 12-17); wherein said first portion of network-specific data defines said network (see col.5 lines 54-57 *"the client-handheld conduit file 232 is used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer."* & col.5 lines 16-19 *"The communications circuitry and the communications port preferably include one or more Network Interface Cards configured to communicate with the network"*. i.e. *The conduit file implicitly included network-specific data*).

14. For claim 14, Bunger teaches the apparatus of claim 9 further comprising a host computing device for:

- installing said device driver (col.9 lines 6-15).

Art Unit: 2191

- generating said data block (col.10 lines 12-17).
- displaying said first portion of network-specific data (col.10 lines 2-11; handheld computer may display the configuration data stored on the handheld).

15. For claim 15, Bunker teaches

- the apparatus of claim 9 wherein said memory is also for storing an AutoRun file and a Setup file (col.6 lines 38-40 & Fig.3 Memory 310 included component 328; installation procedure is automatically install that implicitly included the autorun file, setup executable file).

16. For claim 16, Bunker teaches

- the apparatus of claim 9 wherein said memory comprises one of a flash memory, a read-only memory, a programmable read-only memory, and a magnetic disk memory (col.5 lines 20-21).

17. For claim 17, Bunker teaches

- an apparatus comprising: a station for: (1) transferring a device driver file and a first portion of network-specific data to a host computing device (see col.9 lines 28-34 "*After opening the synchronization session, the client-handheld conduit file is transmitted to the handheld computer. The client-handheld conduit file is received and installed on the handheld computer*");

Art Unit: 2191

- transmitting a data block into a shared-communications medium that constitutes a network (col.4 lines 56-58 & Fig.1);

a host computing device for:

- installing a device driver that is represented by said device driver file (col.9 lines 6-15);
- generating said data block using said device driver to transfer said data block to said station (col.10 lines 12-17); wherein said first portion of network-specific data defines said network (see col.5 lines 54-57 *"the client-handheld conduit file 232 is used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer."* & col.5 lines 16-19 *"The communications circuitry and the communications port preferably include one or more Network Interface Cards configured to communicate with the network". i.e. The conduit file implicitly included network-specific data).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 6,11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Bungler, and in view of Chefalas et al. (US Pub No. 20040015961 B1 hereinafter "Chefalas").

20. For claims 6,11, and 22, Bungler teaches

Art Unit: 2191

20. For claims 6,11, and 22, Bunger teaches

- the method of claim 5 wherein said security configuration comprises authentication-related parameters (col.5 lines 36-38), and wherein said network configuration comprises a network identifier (col.5 lines 16-19; same communication circuitry using on client computer and handheld computer).

But Bunger does not teach

- security configuration comprises encryption related parameter.

However, Chefalas teach

- security configuration comprises encryption related parameter ([0034] e.g. *“Added security protection is provided through encryption of the data transmitted between the user's client computer and the server”*).
- Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bunger's teachings by adding security configuration comprises encryption related parameter by Chefalas in order to ensure secrecy and protect communication and in addition encryption can be accomplished through the use of Secure Sockets Layer technology (Chefalas; [0034] lines 11-12).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on May 4, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argues that:

- (a) In regard to claim 1, Bunker fails to teach or suggest transferring a first portion of network-specific data from a station to a host computing device wherein said first portion of network specific data defines said network.
- (b) In regard to claim 9, Bunker fails to teach or suggest a memory for storing a device driver file and a first portion of network-specific data wherein said first portion of network specific data defines said network.
- (c) In regard to claim 17, Bunker fails to teach or suggest transferring a first portion of network-specific data from a station to a host computing device wherein said first portion of network specific data defines said network.

Examiner's response:

- (a) Examiner disagrees. Bunker discloses transferring a first portion of network-specific data from a station to a host computing device (see col.9 lines 28-34 "*After opening the synchronization session, the client-handheld conduit file is transmitted to the handheld*

Art Unit: 2191

computer. The client-handheld conduit file is received and installed on the handheld computer") wherein said first portion of network specific data defines said network (see col.5 lines 54-57 "the client-handheld conduit file 232 is used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer." & col.5 lines 16-19 "The communications circuitry and the communications port preferably include one or more Network Interface Cards configured to communicate with the network". i.e. The conduit file implicitly included network-specific data).

(b) Examiner disagrees. Bunker discloses a memory for storing a device driver file and a first portion of network-specific data (see col.6 lines 5-10 & Fig.3 the memory block 310 which includes client-handheld conduit file) wherein said first portion of network specific data defines said network (see col.5 lines 54-57 "*the client-handheld conduit file 232 is used to setup a direct communication link between the installation server and the handheld computer.*" & col.5 lines 16-19 "*The communications circuitry and the communications port preferably include one or more Network Interface Cards configured to communicate with the network.*" i.e. *The conduit file implicitly included network-specific data).*

(c) Examiner disagrees. Same reason as item (a).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junchun Wu whose telephone number is 571-270-1250. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-17:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.¹

¹

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JW



WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER